

UNITED STATES

v.

U.S. Army, XXX-XX(b)

Headquarters and Headquarters Company, U.S.
Army Garrison, Joint Base Myer-Henderson Hall,
Fort Myer, VA 22211

FORT LEAVENWORTH WITNESS

DATED: 25 February 2013

4. On 9 May 2011, CPT Joshua Tooman sent a Request for Information (RFI) to CALL. CALL operations department subsequently sent the RFI to me. I looked to see if CALL had produced anything in response to the disclosures to WikiLeaks. I replied to the RFI and supplied three documents from a shared folder that I had created out of professional interest and for educating the workforce on the CALL Shared drive which referenced the WikiLeaks incident:

DEFENSE EXHIBIT 8 for identification
PAGE OFFERED: PAGE ADMITTED:
PAGE of PAGES

- a. CAC Media Review 28 Apr 11.doc;
- b. 20100814_ALARACT 2452010_SENSITIVE INFOR-WIKILEAKs.txt; and
- c. 20100817_ALARACT 246_2010_Application of INFOSEC_Bolger.docx.

I supplied the above three documents to CPT Tooman as part of my response to his RFI.

5. On 10 October 2012, CPT Tooman sent me another email asking if CALL had produced anything in response to the disclosures by WikiLeaks since we had last spoke. I responded to him that I had no further knowledge of any WikiLeaks studies, analysis, or research in CALL at that time. I told CPT Tooman that if he wanted to query CALL about WikiLeaks, he may request that effort by contacting LTC Doug Willis, the CALL OPS and Plans Chief.

6. The following day, 11 October 2012, LTC Willis sent an email to me, CPT Tooman, and the other CALL team leaders. According to the email, LTC Willis confirmed with the other teams that CALL had not done anything related to WikiLeaks.

7. As of today, I am unaware of any order, request, or suggestion directly to me to study and recommend changes to training and doctrine regarding the handling of classified military information, the supervision of Soldiers handling classified military information, or any of the critical Army TTPs or vulnerabilities based upon the disclosure of information to WikiLeaks.

8. Although CALL is the center for the Army's lessons learned, each unit or major command has the ability to capture its own lessons learned without sharing that information with CALL. To my knowledge, CALL was not asked to perform a rapid adaption process in this case. If CALL was not asked to perform a rapid adaption process in this case, it may have been because either the information leaked did not warrant a rapid adaption response or the Army eliminated the need for a rapid adaption process by taking immediate steps to address any issues presented by the leaks. If a rapid adaption was not requested, CALL could have also completed a detailed case study. To my knowledge, CALL was not asked to complete a detailed case study on the leaks in this case either.



ANGEL M. OVERGAARD
CPT, JA
Assistant Trial Counsel



DAVID E. COOMBS
Civilian Defense Counsel



BRADLEY E. MANNING
PFC, USA
Accused